
THE EFFECT OF SUMMARIZING TECHNIQUE ON READING ACHIEVEMENT

Siti Syafi'atul Qomariyah (viamboice@gmail.com)
Faculty of Language and Art Education (FPBS)
Institute of Teacher Training and Education (IKIP) Mataram

ABSTRACT

This article is a report of experimental conducted at the second year students of SMA Kanjeng Sepuh Sidayu Gresik. This study was conducted to measure the effect of summarizing technique on reading achievement. The instrument used for collecting data was test. The data analysis showed that mean of pretest was 37,94 in experimental group and 33,68 in control group. The result of t-test of pre-test was 2,444 and t-critical was 1,684 in level of significant .05. And the mean of post-test was 74,52 in experimental group and 68,39 in control group. The difference between the two mean score is 6.13. The mean of the control group is lower than the experimental one. In which the highest score was 52 and the lowest score was 20 in control group and experimental group. From the data analysis, the writer got findings. The mean score of experimental group was 74.52 and the mean score of control group was 68.39. after applying the ANCOVA formula, it indicates that F-value was 4.117 and the critical value with the level of significance .05 was 4.00. The finding shows that students' achievement of reading in posttest (after treatment) of experimental group was higher than control group. It was found out that summarizing technique was effective in reading achievement.

Key Words: *Summarizing Technique, Reading*

INTRODUCTION

English as the first foreign language in Indonesia has very important functions in some aspects of life. It is not only as a means of international communication, but also as an informational vehicle in transferring and developing science and technology. In all levels education institutions, the use of English is unavoidable. That's why English needs to be learned in formal school.

To learn English we need to work hard. But work hard only does not guarantee that learning will be successful. We will need some more important aspects such as motivation and strategy.

As we know that our curriculum always change, so that is making students confuse and difficult to understand the lesson very well. The teachers must be having the techniques or strategies to improve their process of teaching learning.

According to the 1994 English Basic Course Outline, teaching English as a foreign language covers the teaching of four basic skills, e.g. reading, speaking, listening, and writing. Among them, reading is first most important factor that can support the process of mastering the other skills and improving knowledge. In spite of the importance, the fact shows that not every individual learns it well.

Learning English as foreign language can be boring for the students if the teachers do not know how to give the material or how to present their materials to their students, especially in reading skill. In presenting reading's material, the teacher should be creative and materials used should stimulate the student's interest because usually teaching reading the teacher only asks the students to read and read more without give time to the students to think what is the content of the text.

We learn to read by reading a lot, yet reading a lot is not the emphasis of most reading curricula. There is now considerable evidence that the best way to learn to read (as opposed to translating, or studying) is by extensive reading. Many additional language learning benefits are created by reading extensively as well (Elley, 1991; Krashen, 1993; West, Stanovich, & Mitchell, 1993).

Yet extensive reading is not the central component of reading instruction in most L2 context. The dilemma is not a simple one to respond to school administrators do not typically support daily silent reading in class; teachers do not feel that they are "teaching" when students are reading something enjoyable; and the students often are not motivated to read, because they have not yet experienced the pleasure of reading material that they want to read. Teaching students to use reading strategies is now recognized as important, but helping students to develop a large set of independently operating, efficient reading strategies that relevant to varying needs and context has proven to be extremely difficult. (Grabe, 2002).

Reading fluency requires that the reader know 95% or more of the words encountered in a text for minimal comprehension (Laufer, 1989) and these words need to be recognized automatically with minimal conscious effort. But that sort of vocabulary knowledge requires knowledge of 12,000-20,000 different words (Laufer, 1989; Nation, 1990). Students will only develop such a large automatically recognized vocabulary from consistent, extensive reading. Fluency, then is closely tied to a large reading vocabulary and extensive reading. (Grabe, 2002).

When we pay attention seriously, we can see that the perspective of reading and characteristics of skill reader stresses that the most important thing in reading process, comprehends the message. It probably involves the readers' previous knowledge and intellectual abilities combined with important visual, syntactic, and semantic to interpret the meaning.

To teach students to read, a teacher often finds some problems. Factors such as inability and low interest may account for some aspects of the problem. Many teachers, believing that the problem is inability, have tried diligently to use instructional strategies that help students improve their ability to read expository text.

The teachers need good technique to support their teaching learning process. The writer wants to have an experiment about the effectiveness of summarizing technique in teaching reading on students' achievement at the second year students of SMA Kanjeng Sepuh Sidayu Gresik.

Reading is very complex process while someone getting the meaning. According to Burns, Roe and Ross (1984:11) reading is more than merely recognizing the words for which certain combinations of letters bring about a correct recall. It includes the whole gamut of thinking responses: feeling and defining some need, identifying a solution for meeting the need, selecting from alternative means, experimenting with choice, rejecting or retaining the chosen route, and devising some means of evaluating the result.

Reading is highly complex act. It includes two major components a process and product-each of which is also complicated. Teachers need to be aware of these components and their different aspects in order to respond

effectively to their student's reading need (Burns, Roe and Ross 1994:5).

Harris and Smith (1986) define it as the intellectual and emotional perception of the printed message. They further clarify the key terms of their definition that message implies communication, intentionality and organization, printed means the use of alphabetical code that is, the use of sound spelling patterns and the conventions of punctuation to approximate spoken language; perception indicates the role of personal construction of the message which may vary from reader to reader, emotional shows a recognition of the fact that feeling and connotations prompted by the topic and the author's formulation of the message will color the reader's perceptions; and intellectual identifies the activity as cognitive, rational, and meaning driven.

According to Weaver and Shonkoff (1978, in Heilman, Blair & Rupley 1984:4) three basic theories of reading model; bottom-up, top-down, and interactive theories. Eskey in Simanjuntak (1988) denotes that the bottom-up model reading process is that "reading is a process involving exact, detailed, sequential perceptions and identification of letters, words, spelling patterns, and larger language units". The top-down model of reading focuses on what the readers bring to the process (Goodman, 1967; Smith, 1971, 1982). (Rumelhart,1977; Stanovich,1980)the interactive model stresses both what is on the written page and what a reader brings to it using both top-down and bottom-up skill.

Summarizing technique means condensing and paraphrasing a reading selection into a brief statement that expresses the purpose of the passage,

its overall main idea, some important secondary ideas, and some of the major types of evidence used in support of the main idea (s). (Gregg, 1985).

Mikulecky and Jeffries, 1996 states that summarizing is the retelling of the important parts of passage in much shorter form. The purpose of summarizing is (1) to make sure you have understood something, (2) to explain the sense of passage to someone else, (3) to review texts for examination. A good summary include the main ideas and the major supporting points, and does not include minor details, or the reader's opinion.

Gregg (1985) mentions some characteristics of good summary. They are (1) it is written ordinary paragraph essay form, (2) it begins with the identification material, (3) it clearly states the overall main idea of the original work, (4) it discusses the author's main points and their supporting details in the order followed in the original, (5) it is written in the reader's own words, which filter and condense the author's thought, (6) it does not include large pieces of direct quotation from the original, and (7) it does not contain the readers' reaction to or opinions about the piece. Mikulecky and Jeffries state that steps of summarizing short passages, (1) read the passage all the way through, (2) go back to the beginning and underline the topic sentence in each paragraph. If cannot a find topic sentence, write a short summary of paragraph, (3) put the sentences from the paragraphs together.

Carnine at a.(1990) propose six steps of teaching reading through summarizing technique (1) the teacher tell the students a rule for writing a

main idea sentence, (2) the students read the passage, (3) the teacher asks the students to figure out main idea sentences, (4) the teacher calls on a students to say the sentence (he make correction if the sentence is wrong), (5) the teacher repeats the procedures with the remaining passages, and (6) the teacher has the students write the main idea sentence for each paragraph. Sheinker and Sheinker (1989) also describe the procedures of teaching reading through summarizing activity. The steps they are proposing are that the teacher (1) introduce the purpose of summarizing, situation in which summarizing would be helpful, and a model of summary, (2) explains the steps required in summarizing, rationale for each steps, (3) provides drills on steps of summarizing, (4) asks the students to write a summary of a reading selection following the prescribed steps, (5) asks all class members to brainstorming through the steps, creating a group summary, (6) asks the students to compare their summary to that generated by the group.

Based on the teaching procedures as proposed by some expert above, it can be concluded that basically the teaching steps are as follows: (1) the teacher gets the students ready for an instruction, (2) the teacher asks the students to read either silently or loud, (3) the teacher asks the students the general idea of the text, (4) the teacher asks the students to reread the text in order to find or invent the main idea of each paragraph of the text, (5) the teacher leads the students to determine the important supporting details of each main idea of the paragraph, (6) the teacher leads the students to construct an outline of the text by including only the main idea and important supporting details, (7) the

teacher leads the students to covert an outline into a prose summary, and (8) the teacher corrects the students work and gives the students feedback.

Moreover, it should be emphasized that in the phase of getting the students ready for the instruction especially during the early use of this teaching

technique, the teacher must clearly explain the rules of summarizing texts. In addition, an example of an original text, its model of an outline containing main ideas and important supporting ideas, and its prose summary constructed based on the outline must be introduce.

RESEARCH METHOD

The experiment which is used is a quasi-experimental design applying a non-randomized pretest-posttest control group design. This design is chosen on the basis of consideration that this study is conducted in the organized classroom setting in which the researcher is not permitted to change the class. Each group is measured at the same time with the equivalent materials before treatment and after treatment applied. Then to measure whether the independent variable affect the dependent variable, a post-test was administered to both experimental and control groups. The researcher takes XI (Language) class for experimental group and XI (Science) class for control group as sample.

The type of instrument used was reading test. The type of reading test was in the form of reading text. In this test the students make good summary from the text. The teaching material used for this study was taken from reading text related with the students' subject, and based on KTSP.

RESEARCH FINDING

This analysis was intended to find out the mean of pre-test and post-test. After distributing the test of pre-test to the students and known the result of pre-test, the researcher began to give treatment (summarizing technique) to the experimental group. Before giving the treatment, the researcher gave evaluation about the pre-test because

The first step conducted research was giving pre-test. If there are no significant differences on pretest, the researcher can eliminate as a threat to internal validity and proceed with the study.

The teaching activity used in this treatment activity is two different techniques of teaching reading comprehension. One reading passage was discussed in each teaching session so that 6 reading passages were used for the experimental and 6 sessions for control group.

The last activity in collecting data is administering a post-test which is held when the subjects of the two groups have been learning reading comprehension through different techniques for 3 weeks.

The technique used for data analysis was ANCOVA because the number of the experiment class was the same as the number of the control class and there are some differences between two means. The researcher compared mean score of pre-test and post-test score after given treatment.

some of the students have difficult in English learning.

After distributing the test of pre-test to the students and known the result of pre-test, the researcher began to give treatment (summarizing technique) to the experimental group. Before giving the treatment, the researcher gave evaluation about the pre-test because

some of the students have difficult in English learning.

In the process of treatment the researcher helped the students to make easier to understand what the summarizing technique is, because some of the students felt difficult to understand and made summary.

After giving the treatment in six meeting, the researcher known that the treatment was success or fail based on the exercises that giving in process of treatment and the result of post-test.

After distributing the test to the students, the data collected and analyzed based on procedure of scoring. The mean of pretest was 37,94 in experimental group and 33,68 in control group. The result of t-test of

pre-test was 2,444 and t-critical was 1,684 in level of significant .05. And the mean of post-test was 74,52 in experimental group and 68,39 in control group. The difference between the two mean score is 6.13. the mean of the control group is lower than the experimental one. In which the highest score was 52 and the lowest score was 20 in control group and experimental group.

The application of ANCOVA was intended to find out whether the students taught with summarizing technique has a significantly better achievement than the students taught with non-summarizing technique. The result of computation of students' score of ANCOVA are presented in table 1.

N=31	N=31	N= 62
$\sum X = 1044$	$\sum X = 1176$	$\sum X = 2220$
$\sum Y = 2310$	$\sum Y = 2135$	$\sum Y = 4445$
$\sum X^2 = 37008$	$\sum X^2 = 45584$	$\sum X^2 = 825975$
$\sum Y^2 = 175300$	$\sum Y^2 = 150675$	$\sum Y^2 = 325975$
$\bar{X}_1 = 33,68$	$\bar{X}_2 = 37,94$	$\bar{X} = 35,81$
$\bar{Y}_1 = 74,52$	$\bar{Y}_2 = 68,87$	$\bar{Y} = 71,69$
$r_1 = 0,491$	$r_2 = 0,291$	$R_t = 0,419$
		$F = 4,117$

Table 1. the summary of computing of ANCOVA

On the basis of the result obtained from the data analysis, the working hypothesis was then tested. To make it easier in testing them, however the null hypothesis was formulated. To test the hypothesis, the null hypothesis was stated that the students taught with summarizing technique is not significantly better than the students taught with non-summarizing technique in reading achievement.

Meanwhile, the alternative hypothesis of this research of this study is that mean score of group that is taught by summarizing technique is significantly higher than before taught by summarizing technique.

However, the researcher consult the ANCOVA obtained with the score for

ANCOVA table. For interpretation, the following procedure is used.

If the probably $> .05$; H_0 is rejected

If the probably $> .05$; H_1 is rejected

After the whole score were computed on basis of the above, it was found that the result of the ANCOVA analysis shows that there is significant difference between students taught with summarizing technique and non-summarizing technique in reading achievement. Because there is enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. That summarizing technique was more effective in increasing reading skill than non-summarizing technique.

DISCUSSION

Considering the result of the students' performance during the treatment and post-test, it can be concluded that summarizing technique could improve the students reading skill. It has given the answer to the research question of the present study. It means that the application of summarizing technique is effective.

The summarizing technique could be applied in teaching reading. The implementation of this technique could be adjusted based on the students' proficiency after the treatment.

The important function of summarizing technique was to give more chance to the students to increase their reading skill. According to the writers' observation during the teaching learning process of reading, most of the students didn't know how to write summary. Thus, they really needed a lot of practice in their reading skills especially using summarizing technique.

In line with the result of pre -test post-test toward implementation of summarizing technique, it could be said that there were number of improvements.

The increase of the average score of experimental group before and after treatment is 36,58, much better than the increase of the average score of control group which is 35,19.

It could be included that there is significant difference between students taught with summarizing technique and non-summarizing technique in reading achievement, where summarizing technique is more effective in increasing reading skill than non-summarizing technique.

Based on data analysis, the writer concluded some points concerning with the advantages of the implementation of summarizing technique based on Murrel and Surber in Carnine et al (1990). It was proved that summary technique could improve the students' reading skill. The students can find or determine main idea and critical concept in the selection.

Summarizing can help the students to understand the organization of text material. Summarizing provides students practice in expressive writing. Finally, the effort to identify critical content during the summarizing process can help students remember those idea.

The result of the data analysis shows that there is significant difference between the uses of summarizing technique. The writer also finds there is change of atmosphere in the English lesson after treatment.

The differences atmosphere in learning process before and after treatment are as follows: before treatment most of the students didn't know what the summary is. However, after treatment more than 75% students in the class know how to summary. Before treatment most of the students felt difficult to find the main ideas, but after treatment the students felt easier to find main ideas and the message of the paragraph.

Carnine et. Al (1990) mention that the summarizing not only allows students to identify the key ideas from the passage, but also reduces the information in the passage to key ideas that students can remember.

Flood and Lap (1990) mention "summary writing in its various forms still seems to be one of the best

vehicles available for implementing a constructivist, process oriented approach to teaching reading comprehension”.

Carrel (1984) for example, investigates whether explicit teaching of text structure will facilitate ESL reading comprehension. For her research she classifies the instructional units into categories such as introduction, to-level, high-level, middle-level, and lo-level. Using an experimental design, she implements explicit practice of searching the top-level idea in the text and use the idea to aid comprehension and recall. The study shows that ideas in the text facilitate comprehension as measure by amount of recalled information. In addition, it is also found that such an instruction helps readers’ recall supporting details, major topics, and major subtopics of the text.

Lam and Wong (2000) investigate how training in interaction strategies might be pertinent to the development of oral competence in the ESL secondary classroom. The main focus was to implement and evaluate strategy training in group discussion. The small scale pilot study also aimed to examine the quantity (frequency) and quality (effectiveness) of strategy use after training.

The study shows that in order to help learners use interaction strategies effectively, strategy training had to be complemented by linguistic support. Non proficient learners who are given language help will be able to use interaction strategies more effectively than those who are not. This is particularly true when learners need language support to clarify themselves, since strategy training alone would not be adequate. Strategy training should emphasize team work, so that when learners recognize the

need for clarification and cooperation, they would be motivated to use clarification strategies.

The teaching procedures as experimented by Carrel, Lam and Wong above are also employed in teaching reading with summarizing technique as experimented in the present study.

The finding of the present study indicate that summarizing technique ones in increasing students’ reading achievement. To hold such an interpretation, however, several similar studies need to be conducted. On the other hand, it may also be interpreted that actually the summarizing technique is better to improve students’ reading achievement than non-summarizing technique, but some limitation of the study affect its effectiveness. The second one seems to be more reasonable especially when it is related to experts’ opinion such as Murrell and Surber in Carnine et al. (1990), they state that the effort to determine ideas and critical content during the summarizing process can help the students remember those ideas.

Following the second interpretation the possible causes may lead to such a finding. As stated earlier that the treatment process lasts for only six meetings. This length of time might be too short for detecting real learning effects. This suspicion may be proved by referring to the mean scores of the two groups of the students.

It can be seen that those taught with the former technique make higher achievement than those taught with the latter technique. Therefore, if longer experimentation is held, a significant difference might be obtained.

Some implications drawn from the research finding could be applied into teaching of English as foreign language. Referring back to the situational background for conducting research, the research set up the research to obtain some empirical data on the effectiveness of summarizing technique in teaching reading skill. The underlying reason for getting the data was that the teaching reading skill had not been satisfactory. The

experiment had an effort to get some improvement in teaching reading skill. Some practical implications can be formulated as follows, (1) teaching reading by summarizing technique was the solution to improve reading skill. It was a fact that the score of post-test was higher than pre-test score, even though the difference was significant and (2) whatever teaching strategies were adopted or adapted, it remained necessary to give much emphasis on teaching reading.

CONCLUSION

When we begin to read, we actually have number of initial decisions to make, and we usually make these decisions very quickly, almost unconsciously in most cases. For example, when we pick up a magazine, newspaper, we usually read the front of page with some combination of search processing, general reading comprehension and skimming. We read partly for information, but we also read with a goal to finish the magazine and newspaper fairly rapidly, since few people try to read every line of a newspaper. We may initially search the front page for a particular story that we expect to be there. If the headlines cue us in the right way, we may check quickly for the length of the article, and we may then read through a number of paragraphs for comprehension (appropriately influenced by the magazine and newspaper story genre, a reporting of what, who, when, where, why, and how). At that point, we will decide that we have enough information and will either stop reading the article or skim the remainder to be sure that we do not miss some surprisingly informative part.

As has been stated before, the research was conducted to get some empirical data concerning the effectiveness of summarizing technique on reading achievement.

The application of using summarizing technique in teaching English to the class is then expected to improve the result of the teaching reading in that school. Hence, the writer conducted and experiment in the classroom setting involving one class only. In the treatment meeting the writer applied teaching English by using summarizing technique.

From the data analysis, the writer got findings. The mean score of experimental group was 74.52 and the mean score of control group was 68.39. after applying the ANCOVA formula, it indicates that F-value was 4.117 and the critical value with the level of significance .05 was 4.00.

The result of data analysis shows that the students who are taught with summarizing technique tend to have better reading achievement than those who are taught with the non-summarizing one. In other words, the former technique facilitates learning more than the latter.

The summarizing technique can improve teaching strategies in reading comprehension. And also it is very

helpful for them during the reading class.

Since this study results showed or indicated that the summarizing technique was effective for students in reading, the English teachers especially reading teacher at SMA level may use this model in order to improve the students' reading comprehension ability. The teacher who wants to apply this technique should be known the capability of the

students about reading skill in order to the teacher can apply the summarizing technique as well as possible.

The teacher may develop learning materials based on the technique and their creativity in order to enrich the topic of reading texts as well as the exercises in that technique.

This study investigates the application of summarizing technique, as one of text strategies in teaching reading.

REFERENCES

- Ary, Donald. Jacobs, Lucy C. And Razavieh, Asghar. 2002. *Introduction Research in Education Sixth Edition*. United States of America.
- Burns, Paul. Roe, Betty D. Ross, Elinor P. 1994. *Teaching reading in Today's Elementary Schools*. Houghton Mifflin Company Boston
- Carrell, P.1991. Strategic Reading. In J.E Alatis (Ed.), *Linguistics and Language Pedagogy: The State of The Art*. Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics 1991. Washington. DC: Georgetown University Press
- Grabe, William and Stoller, Fredrika L. 2002. *Teaching and Researching Reading*. Pearson Education Limited Edinburgh Gate Harlow, Essex CM202JE England
- Harris, David P.1969. *Testing English as a Second Language*. Georgetown University